

**Case 2876*****Cetiosauriscus* von Huene, 1927 (Reptilia, Sauropodomorpha):  
proposed designation of *C. stewarti* Charig, 1980 as the type species**

A.J. Charig

*Department of Palaeontology, The Natural History Museum,  
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

**Abstract.** The purpose of this application is to designate *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* Charig, 1980 as the type species of the Jurassic diplodocid sauropod genus *Cetiosauriscus* von Huene, 1927. The specimen on which this genus was founded, and which is now the holotype of *C. stewarti*, was originally identified as *Ornithopsis leedsii* Hulke, 1887 but this has been shown to be an unwarranted identification.

1. Hulke (1887, p. 695) described the partial skeleton of a sauropod from the Kimmeridge Clay of Northamptonshire, England. He referred it to the genus *Ornithopsis* Seeley, 1870 (type species *O. hulkei* Seeley, 1870), but placed it in a new species *O. leedsii* (p. 695). The holotype consists of several vertebrae, ribs, ilium, pubes and ischia; it is registered in the Natural History Museum, London, as BM(NH) Pal. Dept. no. R.1988.

2. Phillips (1871, p. 291) had established a species *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* on a single incomplete skeleton from the Bathonian of Oxfordshire. Seeley (1889, p. 395) stated that *Ornithopsis leedsii* and *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* 'are apparently referable to one genus'. This view was accepted generally, so that *O. leedsii* was attributed to *Cetiosaurus* Owen, 1841 (p. 457).

3. Woodward (1905) described a newly found sauropod skeleton from the Oxford Clay, registered as BM(NH) Pal. Dept. no. R.3078, as another specimen of *Cetiosaurus leedsii*. Whereas most English sauropod discoveries consist of only a few fragments, this one — though lacking any skull material — included an unusually large number of postcranial elements. It was mounted and for many years was exhibited in the Dinosaur Gallery of the Natural History Museum in London.

4. Von Huene (1927, p. 453) claimed that this specimen described by Woodward differed sufficiently from *Cetiosaurus* to warrant its generic separation. He established the genus *Cetiosauriscus* with '*Cetiosaurus leedsii*' (as exemplified by specimen R.3078) as the type species. Von Huene described the characters of specimen R.3078 that were diagnostic of his new genus and contrasted them with *Cetiosaurus*. The type species of *Cetiosaurus*, *C. medius* Owen, 1842 (p. 100), is itself unsatisfactory. Steel (1970, pp. 64–65) pointed out that *C. medius* was 'based upon vertebrae' and that the genus *Cetiosaurus* was 'founded upon very insubstantial criteria and is hence difficult to define'.

5. I (Charig, 1980, p. 242) pointed out that the only element preserved in both the holotype of *Ornithopsis leedsii* (R.1988, para. 1 above) and the specimen referred to that species by Woodward (R.3078, para. 3 above) was the ilium. Seeley (1889, p. 394) had written of R.1988 that 'from the imperfect fragment preserved it is

impossible to judge of the form of the ilium'. I re-examined the fragment in question and confirmed that it was impossible to compare it with the ilium of R.3078. Indeed, since this is the only element common to both specimens the two cannot be compared in any particular and R.3078 cannot be referred to *O. leedsii* or to any other species. There being no specific name for the specimen described by Woodward and used by von Huene to establish *Cetiosauriscus*, I proposed (1980, p. 242) the new name *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* and noted that consideration of this change of nominal type species (but not of taxonomic basis) should be referred to the Commission. This I now do under Article 70b (misidentified type species).

6. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all previous fixations of type species for the nominal genus *Cetiosauriscus* von Huene, 1927 and to designate *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* Charig, 1980 as the type species;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Cetiosauriscus* von Huene, 1927 (gender: masculine), type species by designation in (1) above *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* Charig, 1980;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *stewarti* Charig, 1980, as published in the binomen *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* (specific name of the type species of *Cetiosauriscus* von Huene, 1927).

## References

- Charig, A.J. 1980. A diplodocid sauropod from the Lower Cretaceous of England. Pp. 231-244 in Jacobs, L.L. (Ed.). *Aspects of vertebrate history: essays in honor of Edwin Harris Colbert*. xix, 407 pp. Museum of Northern Arizona Press, Flagstaff.
- Huene, F. von. 1927. Sichtung der Grundlagen der jetzigen Kenntnis der Sauropoden. *Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae*, 20(3): 444-470.
- Hulke, J.W. 1887. Note on some dinosaurian remains in the collection of A. Leeds, Esq., of Eyebury, Northamptonshire. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*, 43: 695-702.
- Owen, R. 1841. A description of a portion of the skeleton of the *Cetiosaurus*, a gigantic extinct saurian reptile occurring in the Oolitic formations of different portions of England. *Proceedings of the Geological Society of London*, 3(2), no. 80: 457-462.
- Owen, R. 1842. Report on British fossil reptiles, part 2. *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, 1841: 60-204.
- Phillips, J. 1871. *Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames*. 523 pp. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Seeley, H.G. 1870. On *Ornithopsis*, a gigantic animal of the pterodactyle kind from the Wealden. *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, (4)5(28): 279-283.
- Seeley, H.G. 1889. Note on the pelvis of *Ornithopsis*. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*, 45: 391-397.
- Steel, R. 1970. *Saurischia*, vol. 14 in Kuhn, O. (Ed.), *Handbuch der Paläoherpetologie*. v, 87 pp. Fischer, Stuttgart & Portland.
- Woodward, A.S. 1905. On parts of the skeleton of *Cetiosaurus leedsii*, a sauropodous dinosaur from the Oxford Clay of Peterborough. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, 1905: 232-243.